

§ [What's New](#) || [Search](#) || [Legal Archive](#) || [Wog Media](#) || [Cult Media](#) || [CoW®](#) || [Writings](#) || [Fun](#) || [Disclaimer](#) || [Contact](#) §

-----Original Message-----

From: Gerry Armstrong [mailto:gerry@gerryarmstrong.org]
Sent: Thursday, August 16, 2007 8:00 AM
To: 'knoxon@earthlink.net'
Subject: RE: Revised hearing date

August 16, 2007

Kendrick L. Moxon, Esquire
Moxon & Kobrin
3055 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 900
Los Angeles, CA 90010

By E-mail: knoxon@earthlink.net

Re: Scientology v. Armstrong
Marin Superior Court Case No. CV021632

Dear Mr. Moxon:

You're not clear what "no" means. It certainly wouldn't be courteous if you were saying, no you weren't going to ask your client. In the circumstances
-- not in the gloss of decency or courtesy you and your client affect in this matter and in your whole Scientology-wide war on me -- my offer to your client is very reasonable and even generous.

As you know, I know I am dealing here with a sociopath with untold millions to spend on making his evil postulates come true, a violent, not quite bright bully, with dishonest lawyers like yourself to make those evil postulates "legal" and make you both look "courteous." Pursuant to SPD 28, you can't even *grant me credence* or the little ecclesiopath will turn his "Suppressive Person" doctrine on you, so it is reasonable to conclude, other than as a pretense in furtherance of Miscavige's ev purps, you are not going to be courteous to me.
<http://www.gerryarmstrong.org/50grand/cult/sp/spd-28-1982-08-13-txt.html>

Your answer to my question as to what your client proposes as an agreement regarding e-mailing courtesy copies of court documents or other documents in this case, is also unclear, although your client's intention is clear, and should be terminated. You haven't been e-mailing papers to me as a courtesy.
You e-mailed me your motion after you lied about doing so on your Proof of Service. So, no, I don't want what you've been doing, and I won't reciprocate. As for one-sided unconditionality, tell your head Nuts!

If your client refuses to agree to mutual e-mailed courtesy copies of court documents in this case, then I suppose there is no choice but to rely completely on our national postal systems or couriers. But why not ask him one more time and see if he won't, just for a moment, be reasonable.

Yours sincerely,

Gerry Armstrong
#2-46298 Yale Road
Chilliwack, B.C. V2P 2P6
Canada
604-703-1373

-----Original Message-----

From: kmoxon@earthlink.net [mailto:kmoxon@earthlink.net]

Sent: Wednesday, August 15, 2007 10:38 PM

To: Gerry Armstrong

Subject: RE: Revised hearing date

No. I've been emailing papers to you as a courtesy. If you don't want that and choose not to reciprocate unconditionally, I'll send everything according to the Code of Civil Procedure.

Kendrick Moxon

-----Original Message-----

>From: Gerry Armstrong <gerry@gerryarmstrong.org>

>Sent: Aug 15, 2007 11:09 AM

>To: kmoxon@earthlink.net

>Subject: RE: Revised hearing date

>

>August 15, 2007

>

>Kendrick L. Moxon, Esquire

>Moxon & Kobrin

>3055 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 900

>Los Angeles, CA 90010

>

>By E-mail: kmoxon@earthlink.net

>

> Re: Scientology v. Armstrong

> Marin Superior Court Case No. CV021632

>

>Dear Mr. Moxon:

>

>Please ask your client, how about if I e-mail you the request I sent to

>the Court on the condition that he grant the request for a continuance

>I've been asking both of you for?"

>

>We don't have an agreement regarding e-mailing courtesy copies of court

>documents, or other documents in this case. What does your client propose?

>

>Yours sincerely,

>

>Gerry Armstrong

>#2-46298 Yale Road

>Chilliwack, B.C. V2P 2P6

>Canada

>604-703-1373

>

>

>

>-----Original Message-----

>From: kmoxon@earthlink.net [mailto:kmoxon@earthlink.net]

>Sent: Tuesday, August 14, 2007 9:29 PM

>To: Gerry Armstrong

>Subject: RE: Revised hearing date

>

>Please email whatever request you made to the court.

>

>Kendrick Moxon

>

>-----Original Message-----

>>From: Gerry Armstrong <gerry@gerryarmstrong.org>

>>Sent: Aug 14, 2007 5:34 PM

>>To: kmoxon@earthlink.net

>>Subject: RE: Revised hearing date

>>

>>August 14, 2007

>>

>>Kendrick L. Moxon, Esquire

>>Moxon & Kobrin

>>3055 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 900

>>Los Angeles, CA 90010

>>

>>By E-mail: kmoxon@earthlink.net

>>

>> Re: Scientology v. Armstrong

>> Marin Superior Court Case No. CV021632

>>

>>Dear Mr. Moxon:

>>

>>Thank you. Since it is impossible to comply with the injunction, I

>>cannot but refuse your offer. Since the injunction is unlawful and

>>moreover unconscionable, I consider your client's offer extortion. I

>>have requested the continuance from the Court.

>>

>>Yours sincerely,

>>

>>Gerry Armstrong

>>#2-46298 Yale Road

>>Chilliwack, B.C. V2P 2P6

>>Canada

>>604-703-1373

>>

>>-----Original Message-----

>>From: kmoxon@earthlink.net [mailto:kmoxon@earthlink.net]

>>Sent: Monday, August 13, 2007 10:36 AM

>>To: Gerry Armstrong

>>Subject: RE: Revised hearing date

>>

>>Mr. Armstrong:

>>

>>To clarify my response to your request for a continuance:

>>

>>I represent the Church of Scientology International, which is the

>>plaintiff in the case in which we are engaged and is the party which

>>made the motion set for September 7th. My client has authorized me to

>>continue that motion on the condition that until the motion is

>>resolved, you FULLY comply with the terms of the injunction for which

>>you have repeatedly been held in contempt. Otherwise, make your

>>motion for

>a continuance.

>>

>>I chose not to respond to any other comment you have made.

>>

>>Kendrick Moxon

>>

>>-----Original Message-----

>>>From: Gerry Armstrong <gerry@gerryarmstrong.org>

>>>Sent: Aug 9, 2007 10:15 AM

>>>To: kmoxon@earthlink.net

>>>Subject: RE: Revised hearing date

>>>

>>>August 9, 2007

>>>

>>>Kendrick L. Moxon, Esquire

>>>Moxon & Kobrin

>>>3055 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 900

>>>Los Angeles, CA 90010

>>>

>>>By E-mail: kmoxon@earthlink.net

>>>

>>> Re: Scientology v. Armstrong

>>> Marin Superior Court Case No. CV021632

>>>

>>>Dear Mr. Moxon:

>>>

>>>I am very interested in your offer. It's clear I think we're already

>>>half way toward a sane arrangement and the resolution of the

>>>Scientology

>>>v.

>>>Armstrong war.

>>>

>>>I do want to be sure that you have your client's agreement to make

>>>this offer. As you know, you're untrustworthy, as is your client, of

>>>course, so I have to go into this with my eyes open. Both of you

>>>could easily sucker me into agreeing to something, or otherwise

>>>easing up on my willingness to fight back, and then pull the old

>>>sorry-I-wasn't-authorized-to-make-that-offer dodge, or your client

>>>could label you a rogue. So please confirm that your client

>>>authorizes your proposal. It goes without saying that your client,

>>>certainly in this case, although it's captioned Scientology v.

>>>Armstrong, is, for decisional matters of this magnitude, David Miscavige.

>>>

>>>Please let me know as soon as possible if your client proposes this

>>>arrangement or agrees to the arrangement you propose. Also, please

>>>don't ignore forever what you call my "scurrilous, untrue and

>>>unnecessary comments." I am actually anxious to hear from you exactly

>>>what your client or you mean, and what are these comments of mine

>>>that your client or you find scurrilous, untrue and unnecessary. I

>>>think that if I could have the opportunity to prove to you both that

>>>my comments were not scurrilous, untrue or unnecessary, it would move

>>>us even closer to resolution of your war on me.

>>>

>>>I will only take up one of the adjectives you attach to my comments;

>>>that they were "unnecessary." My comments, I'm sure you will agree,

>>>are all in support of my request for an extension of time to respond

>>>to your motion to reinstitute jail sentences and for arrest warrants

>>>against

>>>me.

>>>

>>>I'm sure you'll also agree that the extension of time is itself
>>>necessary, and clearly not unnecessary. I state, e.g., in my request
>>>for

>>an extension:

>>>"I require an extension of time of 60 days to oppose your motion or
>>>take whatever other action is warranted and to prepare for a hearing
>>>on your motion or other actions." If the extension of time itself was
>>>unnecessary, I would not have stated that I required it, but would
>>>have written that I didn't require it. That would have rendered the
>>>reasons I gave for the unnecessary extension unnecessary. But I
>>>didn't write that; I wrote that the extension of time I was
>>>requesting of 60 days to oppose your motion or take whatever other
>>>action is warranted and to prepare for a hearing on your motion or
>>>other actions was not unnecessary
>>but necessary.

>>>

>>>If it had only been necessary that I requested the extension and your
>>>client and you would have granted the request without any question,
>>>then what I wrote to explain, in advance of your anticipated
>>>question, why the extension was necessary would have been,
>>>conceivably at least, unnecessary. The request itself, provided in
>>>the above quoted sentence ("I require an extension of time of 60 days
>>>to oppose your motion or take whatever other action is warranted and
>>>to prepare for a hearing on your motion or other
>>>actions.") contains nothing scurrilous or untrue, I'm sure you also
>>>cannot but agree. As shown above, moreover, the request itself was
>>>necessary, and, it can be concluded, it was necessary that I make it.
>>>Whatever you are just alleging to be scurrilous, untrue and
>>>unnecessary comments, therefore, must be contained within whatever I
>>>wrote beyond that single sentence to, as I explained, explain why the
>>>extension was
>>necessary.

>>>

>>>You write that you will ignore what you say are my scurrilous, untrue
>>>and unnecessary comments for the moment. Clearly, if you can ignore
>>>what you say are my scurrilous, untrue and unnecessary comments for
>>>one moment, you can for every other moment. In that moment or all
>>>those moments, if in truth your client and you viewed everything else
>>>as unnecessary, you would have viewed my simple necessary request as
>>>necessary
>>and granted it.

>>>

>>>But you didn't grant my simple and necessary request, which leads me
>>>to the conclusion that you're not being truthful; which of course
>>>would fit with your well known untrustworthiness I commented on above.
>>>What I wrote, each and every comment, was necessary, and I believe
>>>you cannot but know it. The only reasonable interpretation is that I
>>>still haven't said enough, made enough comments, to explain to you
>>>why your client and you should grant my request. I am ready, however,
>>>to be shown in this matter that I'm wrong, and that you really
>>>believe my comments were unnecessary, by your client and you granting
>>>my
request.

>>>Just set the hearing on your motion and the OEX for October 26.

>>>

>>>During this time, your client and you can pull back any PIs or
>>>process server thugs you've sicced on Caroline and me and we can all
>>>dialogue about the resolution of the whole Scientology v. Armstrong war.

>>>

>>>Yours sincerely,

>>>

>>>

>>>Gerry Armstrong

>>>#2-46298 Yale Road

>>>Chilliwack, B.C. V2P 2P6

>>>Canada

>>>604-703-1373

>>>

>>>

>>>

>>>-----Original Message-----

>>>From: kmoxon@earthlink.net [mailto:kmoxon@earthlink.net]

>>>Sent: Wednesday, August 08, 2007 12:04 PM

>>>To: Gerry Armstrong

>>>Subject: RE: Revised hearing date

>>>

>>>Mr. Armstrong:

>>>

>>>I will ignore your scurrilous, untrue and unnecessary comments for
>>>the moment.

>>>

>>>However, I would be willing to provide an extension of the date set
>>>for the hearing only under the condition that until the matter is
>>>determined, you FULLY comply with the terms of the injunction for
>>>which you have repeatedly been held in contempt. If you agree to
>>>these terms, I will grant you all the time you desire.

>>>

>>>Kendrick Moxon

>>>

>>>-----Original Message-----

>>>>From: Gerry Armstrong <gerry@gerryarmstrong.org>

>>>>Sent: Aug 6, 2007 7:55 PM

>>>>To: kmoxon@earthlink.net

>>>>Subject: RE: Revised hearing date

>>>>

>>>>August 6, 2007

>>>>

>>>>Kendrick L. Moxon, Esquire

>>>>Moxon & Kobrin

>>>>3055 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 900

>>>>Los Angeles, CA 90010

>>>>

>>>>By E-mail: kmoxon@earthlink.net

>>>>

>>>>Re: Scientology v. Armstrong

>>>>Marin Superior Court Case No. CV021632

>>>>

>>>>Dear Mr. Moxon:

>>>>

>>>>Actually, no, September 7 is not plenty of time to respond to your
>>>>motion to reinstate the sentences against me. I require an extension

>>>>of time of 60 days to oppose your motion or take whatever other
>>>>action is warranted and to prepare for a hearing on your motion or
>>>>other
>actions.

>>>>I suggest Friday October 26, 2007 as a reasonable date for
>>>>recalendarng
>>>>your motion.

>>>>

>>>>Clearly, your client has done nothing for, as you state in your
>>>>motion, more than a year and a half, at least overtly or openly, to
>>>>get the Marin Court to reinstate your ill-gotten and already
>>>>adjudged unconscionable jail sentences. All that time you say your
>>>>client remained hopeful that I would come to my senses, so
>>>>consequently your client and you did nothing. Please be assured that
>>>>in relevant sense your doing nothing was fully rewarded, because I
>>>>did come to my senses, in fact I had largely come to my senses in
>>>>December 1981 when I decided to escape from the Scientology cult.
>>>>Since I've demonstrably come to my senses, your client will not in
>>>>any way be prejudiced if it, and all the Scientology parties and
>>>>beneficiaries in this matter, keep hoping
>>>>another 60 days.

>>>>

>>>>Who on earth could have imagined that after all this time even David
>>>>Miscavige would seek to reinstate these sentences that Judge Duryee
>>>>already found to be unconscionable? Although I recognized and
>>>>accepted some time ago that Miscavige is a clear sociopath, as I
>>>>said, I never imagined he would be so pathologically vindictive as
>>>>to have you do what
>>>>you're doing for him.

>>>>Thus I am completely unprepared to defend myself in this surprising,
>>>>demented and of course threatening attack. I need the opportunity to
>>>>hire an attorney, and I need the opportunity for the attorney to
>>>>study the twenty-five years of cases and documents in Scientology's
>>>>litigation campaign against me.

>>>>

>>>>As I'm certain you know, I don't have the funds to fly to California
>>>>whenever Miscavige gets one of his little Barbarossan brainwaves. I
>>>>have been kept impoverished largely by the actions and threats of
>>>>your client, Miscavige and his henchmen. It will take some
>>>>significant time to raise the necessary travel money. Obviously
>>>>justice mandates that I be given a fair opportunity to travel to a
>>>>hearing like this, even if Scientology's and Miscavige's purpose for
>>>>seeking the reinstatement of the sentences against me is not only an
>>>>evil
>purpose but unlawful.

>>>>

>>>>Obviously too I'd rather not waste everyone's time with having to
>>>>file an application with the Court for an extension of time to
>>>>respond when your client can simply agree to such an extension and
>>>>can reschedule the hearing from September 7 to October 26 as easily
>>>>as you rescheduled it from August
>>>>27 to September 7. I know it is one of Scientology's ev purps to
>>>>waste everyone's time, but perhaps Miscavige can get it under
>>>>control for a minute and agree to the 60 day extension I'm
>>>>requesting. I think that 60 days is the least he could do.

>>>>

>>>>Please let me know as soon as your client agrees or not because
>>>>clearly, although it wasn't for your client for all those many
>>>>months, time is now of the essence.

>>>>

>>>>Yours sincerely,

>>>>

>>>>Gerry Armstrong

>>>>#2-46298 Yale Road

>>>>Chilliwack, B.C. V2P 2P6

>>>>Canada

>>>>604-703-1373

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>-----Original Message-----

>>>>From: kmoxon@earthlink.net [mailto:kmoxon@earthlink.net]

>>>>Sent: Monday, August 06, 2007 6:01 PM

>>>>To: gerry@gerryarmstrong.org

>>>>Subject: Revised hearing date

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>To ensure you have plenty of time to respond to my motion to
>>>>reinstate the sentences against you, I have moved the hearing to
>>>>September

>>7th.

>>>>A copy was served via federal express, but another copy is attached.

>>>>

>>>>Kendrick Moxon

>>>>

>>>

>>>

>>

>>

>

>